

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-6 are amended and claims 7-14 are added. Support for the Amendments to claims 1-5 can be found at, for example, the specification on page 2, lines 13-15. Support for claims 7 and 9-13 can be found at claims 1-6, respectively, and support for claims 8 and 14 can be found at original claim 3. No new matter is added.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 1-6 are objected to because there is allegedly lack of antecedent basis for "each function" in line 6 of claims 1-5 and line 5 of claim 5. Each of claims 1-5 provide proper antecedent basis for "each function." However, claims 1-5 are amended to recite "each function defined by the function name," for clarity. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because it is allegedly unclear which interface definition language is referenced by "using an interface definition language which is partly common to an interface definition language directed to a software object." Claims 1-5 are amended to each recite "using a first interface definition language which is partly common to a second interface definition language directed to a software object."

Claim 3 is also rejected because it is allegedly not clear if the means for inputting and outputting arguments and return values is optional. By this Amendment, the features of the second to last paragraph of claim 3 are canceled and incorporated into new claim 8 and the allegedly optional features of the last paragraph of claim 3 is amended to more clearly recite that these features are not optional, but an integral part of claim 3.

Claim 3 is also rejected because it is allegedly unclear which circuit has the means for outputting and inputting a return value. Claim 3 is amended to recite "the server logical circuit and the client logical circuit each having at least one of the means for outputting a return value and the means for inputting a return value."

Claim 3 is also rejected because it is allegedly unclear what is meant by "at least of the" in the last paragraph. As suggested in the Office Action, claim 3 is amended to recite "at least one of the" in line 2 of the last paragraph of claim 3.

Claim 5 is rejected because it is allegedly not clear what is meant by "realizing the comprises" in line 7 of claim 5. By this Amendment, claim 5 is amended to recite "realizing the interface comprises," as suggested in the Office Action.

Claim 6 is rejected because the connection terminal allegedly does not need to be connected with the server interface device. By this Amendment, claim 6 is amended to recite a "connection terminal of the client interface is connected to at least one of the server interface circuit or a system bus." Accordingly, this Amendment clarifies that the connection terminal is not unconnected.

For the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,308,225 to Schofield. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-12 each recite a "hardware interface." At least these features are not taught by Schofield. Schofield teaches a method for performing distributed object calls between a client application and a server application. As such, Schofield teaches a method of defining IDL interfaces in software only. This is not "defining a hardware interface," as recited in claims 1-3, 7, 9 and 10 or "having a hardware interface," as recited in claims 4, 5,

11, and 12. Thus, Schofield fails to anticipate claims 1-5, 7 and 9-12, as well as claims 6, 8, 13 and 14 depending from claims 3, 5, 10 and 12, respectively.

For the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Schofield in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,956 to Harjanto. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

For the reasons set forth above, Schofield fails to teach all the features of claims 5 and 12 from which claims 6 and 13, respectively, depend. Therefore, claims 6 and 13 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional features recited in claims 6 and 13, respectively.

For the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS:GMH/eks

Attachment:
Amendment Transmittal

Date: December 13, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--